IT SPECIALIST (INFOSEC/PLCYPLN) GS-2210-12 POSITION EVALUATION SUMMARY

Organization:	Various USACE Districts
Position No.:	

Evaluation Factors	Factor Level Used (FL No., etc.)	Points Assigned	Comments
Knowledge Required by the Position	FL 1-7	1250	See Page 1 & 2
2. Supervisory Controls	FL 2-4	450	See Page 2
3. Guidelines	FL 3-4	450	See Page 2
4. Complexity	FL 4-5	325	See Page 2 & 3
5. Scope and Effect	FL 5-4	225	See Page 3
6/7. Personal Contacts and Purpose of Contacts	Level 3C	180	
8. Physical Demands	FL 8-1	5	
9. Work Environment	FL 9-1	5	
Total Points		2890	Standards Used
Grade Conversion		GS-12 (2755-3150 point range)	GS-2200, IT Guide dated May 2001

Additional Remarks:

- 1. The job assignments and requirements of this position fully equal the occupational series definition for the Information Technology Management occupational series reflected on page 4 of the above referenced PCS and therefore this job is properly classified to the GS-2210 occupational series. It is titled as IT Specialist (INFOSEC/PLCYPLN) since the assignments involve work predominately in two of the IT Specialties (Information Security and Policy and Planning) with each having equal importance and grade level value. Guidance on Page 4 of the above referenced PCS is the basis for the above title determination.
- 2. Brief analysis of the reasoning for above evaluations for grade impacting factors is provided as follows:
- FL 1-7 (1250 Points) The knowledge requirements of this job, for both specialties, exceed FL 1-6 requirements where specialists normally perform routine recurring assignments in the Policy and Planning

and Information Security specialties such as providing input to drafting position papers on IT issues. monitor state-of-the- art IT developments, identifying Information security violations and recommending corrective action, etc. Subject job reflects requirements for serving as the INFOSEC and PLCYPLN technical expert within a District advising District managers, specialists and IT users on long and short rang planning, conducting strategic planning studies, developing and maintaining the DITSCAP program for the District, determining the security impact of systems changes, and serving as the focal point concerning the resolution of information security/assurance problems vulnerabilities. This is consistent with FL 1-7 requirements reflected in the evaluation criteria on page 33 of the guide and the FL 1-7 illustrations reflected on pages 74 -77 of the guide. The requirements of this job do not meet FL 1-8 requirements. This level requires the mastery advanced Policy and Planning IT principles, concepts methods, standards, and practices to develop knowledge management program plans, policies and standards; lead the development of an enterprise IT modernization plan; and other comparable functions reflected on pages 40 and 87 of the guide. It requires a mastery of total infrastructure protection, systems security certification and accreditation and Federal information systems security protocols to integrate systems security with other security disciplines, certify systems or network accreditation, and ensure coordination and/or collaboration on security activities and other comparable functions reflected on page 40 and 88 of the guide. Typically, FL 1-8 knowledge requirements are associated with serving as an IT expert who accomplishes specialty services pertinent to agency level programs (i.e. Department of the Army); providing expert technical advice on a wide range Information Assurance/Security and Policy and Planning issues. While the job description reflects that the incumbent is an expert in both specialty fields, the expertise is centered locally within the District and does not require the application FL1-8 knowledge that would be required for a technical expert in a higher level USACE organization. Such Knowledge requirements are not typical of the requirements of this job.

- FL 2-4 (450 Points) The supervisory controls of this job exceed FL 2-3 requirements where supervisors define/provide plans and approaches for specialists to follow; there are clear precedents to follow; and the specialist resolves common problems but takes more difficult problems to supervisor for resolution. Specialists assigned to this job participate with supervisor in determining time frames, scopes of assignments and possible approaches and independently plan approaches, methods to be used, apply new methods to resolve controversial or problematic situations. This is consistent with requirements reflected at FL 2-4 on page 47 of the above referenced PCS. This job does not contain FL 2-5 requirements where specialists work under broad administrative supervision and are responsible for and serve as technical authorities for significant agency or equivalent level IT program/function where specialists define the objectives of an assignment associated with the program/function.
- FL 3-4 (450 Points) The guidelines of this job exceed that reflected for FL 3-3. Level 3 positions use a wide variety of generally common reference materials and manuals that are more local in nature; relate specifically to assignments; and, include the availability of precedents for resolving problems. In addition to FL 3-3 guidelines, incumbents of this job use USACE-level guides/policy statements. The guidelines for the assignments of this job are often scarce, inapplicable, have gaps in specificity requiring considerable interpretation/adaptation and deviation from established methods. Additionally, incumbents are responsible for developing local District guidelines and policies covering assigned specialties. This is consistent with Level 3-4 evaluation criteria reflected on page 51 of the guide. This job fails to equal FL 3-5 requirements. At that level, guidelines are often ambiguous and specialists are viewed by top agency management, as the technical experts in assigned specialty areas. At this level specialists formulate/develop interpretations that take the form of policy statements and guidelines. Such FL 3-5 guideline requirements are not characteristic of this job.

- FL 4-5 (325 Points) This position exceeds FL 4-4 complexity characteristics. At FL 4-4 positions deal with many different and unrelated processes/methods pertinent to IT functions where there is a need to consider different approaches to deal with incomplete/conflicting data. This requires the use of judgment/originality in interpretation of data, planning the work and refining methods/techniques of the work. The incumbent of this position must apply what is described at FL 4-4, but in addition develop new standards, methods, and techniques and conceive/develop solutions to highly complex technical problems. As the highest level Information Assurance/Security and Policy and IT Planning specialist in District the incumbent encounters the most difficult and complex policy and planning projects/problems that arise. This is consistent with FL 4-5. FL 4-6 requirements are not met. FL 4-6 criteria deals with IT areas where no precedents exist, requiring the establishing of new concepts, theories, and programs to solve problems that have resisted solution. Such characteristics are not typical of this job.
- FL 5-4 (225 Points) The scope and effect of the work of this job exceeds FL 5-3. At that level positions deal with a variety of common problems/situations that are generally handled by established criteria and the work affects the quality and reliability of local services etc. Incumbents in this job must establish criteria, formulate projects, etc., for a variety of unusual conditions/problems where the work impacts a wide range of District-wide activities/organizations. This is consistent with FL 5-4 requirements. FL 5-5 is not met since the work involves isolating/defining unprecedented conditions and developing/testing new techniques that affect the work of technical experts and/or the development of major portions of agency-wide IT programs. The scope and effect of the work of FL 5-5 specialists is much broader than that which would be found for USACE District level specialists.
- The last four Factors (Factor 6,7,8, and 9) are clearly evaluated to the levels reflected above and do not need supplemental evaluation analysis.